

REPORT

DATE: April 3, 2008

TO: Administration Committee
Regional Council

FROM: District Evaluations Subcommittee

SUBJECT: Regional Council District Evaluations Process and Recommendations

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S APPROVAL:



RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve recommendations made by the District Evaluations Subcommittee, which includes adding two additional Regional Council Districts (Districts #66 and #67) and making adjustments to the current composition of existing Regional Council Districts.

BACKGROUND:

The SCAG Bylaws provide that the Regional Council must review the current composition of the Regional Council Districts every five (5) years, based upon the current city population data from the State Department of Finance. The Bylaws also state that the Regional Council is to review the district boundaries in 2004, and thereafter, in every year ending in 3 and 8.

In accordance with the Bylaws, the District Evaluations Subcommittee (Subcommittee) was reactivated last fall to undertake the district evaluations process. The members of the Subcommittee, representing each of the six (6) counties within the SCAG region, are:

Hon. Larry McCallon, City of Highland (representing San Bernardino County), Chair;
Hon. Toni Young, City of Port Hueneme (representing Ventura County), Vice-Chair;
Hon. Margaret Clark, City of Rosemead (representing Los Angeles County);
Hon. Richard Dixon, City of Lake Forest (representing Orange County);
Hon. Jon Edney, City of El Centro (representing Imperial County); and
Hon. Greg Pettis, City of Cathedral City (representing Riverside County).

Starting in December 2007, the Subcommittee met each month and concluded its evaluation process on March 20, 2008. As part of the process, the Subcommittee reviewed information such as the current population data from the State Department of Finance as well as recommendations from various subregional organizations regarding proposed changes to the current composition of the Regional Council Districts. Subregional organizations were invited to participate and provide input to the Subcommittee throughout the district evaluation process.

The SCAG Bylaws provide that "a [Regional Council] District shall be established by the Regional Council and be comprised of a group of cities that have a geographic community of interest and have approximately equal population." (Emphasis added). This is based upon the principle of proportional representation, or a "one person, one vote" system. SCAG's Bylaws also provide that a Regional Council District "may be

REPORT

comprised of cities within different counties, but Districts established by subregions ... shall include only cities within the boundaries of such subregions.” Finally, the Bylaws establish a maximum of 67 Regional Council Districts, and there are currently 65 Regional Council Districts, leaving room to establish at most two additional Districts.

SUMMARY:

As part of its evaluation process, the District Evaluations Subcommittee determined that SCAG staff should follow the same approach used last time for reviewing district boundaries. As such, the goal is for each Regional Council District to have a population of approximately a quarter million people, with a population deviation of 50,000 people. Therefore, the objective is that that Regional Council Districts represent a population range of between 200,000 to 300,000 people.

Applying this approach in conjunction with the 2007 city population data obtained from the State Department of Finance, staff found that there are 17 Regional Council Districts which fall outside of the recommended population range. Included with this report is a table (see Attachment “A”) listing the current District population data, the city population data as well as the recommendations by the Subcommittee regarding the Districts which fall outside of the recommended population range.

In some case, certain Districts which are outside of this range may not be modified due to the provisions in the Bylaws. As examples, Districts 1, 36 and 44, while all having populations under 200,000 people, include cities within the boundaries of the Imperial Valley Association of Governments (IVAG), the Arroyo Verdugo Cities subregion and the Las Virgenes Malibu Council of Governments respectively, and therefore may not be modified pursuant to the Bylaws in order to preserve the subregional boundaries. There are other Districts whose total populations are outside of the range, but whose current configurations represent a geographic community of interest. Finally, there are certain Districts, such as Districts 16 and 19, which represent large individual cities (Santa Ana and Anaheim, respectively) whose population exceed the recommended population range, but would not make sense to fracture at this point in time.

A summary of the key recommendations made by the Subcommittee, by county, is provided as follows:

Imperial County

- District #1: District #1 comprises the cities within the IVAG subregion and has a collective population outside of the recommended population range at 133,613 people. The Subcommittee, including Mayor Edney who served on the Subcommittee to represent the interests of the cities within Imperial County, recommends no changes be made to this District in order to preserve the subregional boundaries of IVAG.

Los Angeles County

- District #29: District #29 currently is one of two RC districts assigned to the City of Long Beach. As part of the District Evaluation process, staff uncovered that the City of Avalon is currently not assigned to a RC District. Staff had initially recommended that Avalon be assigned to District #24, but it was Avalon’s preference to be assigned to one of Long Beach’s Regional Council Districts (i.e. Districts #29 and #30). The two cities discussed the matter, and according to Long Beach representatives, Long

REPORT

Beach will accommodate Avalon's request provided Long Beach maintains the ability to appoint Long Beach City Council members to both RC District seats assigned to Long Beach. Long Beach noted that the size of the city in relation to the SCAG region justified it maintaining its two Regional Council seats. Avalon has no objection to Long Beach's proposal, concluding that it has more of a community of interest with Long Beach than with the cities in District #24, and that Long Beach would best represent Avalon's interests.

Long Beach also presented two options regarding the configurations of Districts #29 and #30, based upon this proposal. The Subcommittee reviewed these options, and the Subcommittee unanimously supported assigning the City of Avalon to one of the Districts assigned to Long Beach, which the configuration of such districts to be established as follows: (1) designate RC District #29 as comprising Long Beach and Avalon, and made up of seven (7) council members from the City of Long Beach and the five (5) council members from the City of Avalon; and (2) designate RC District #30 as comprising the City of Long Beach only, and made up of two city council members from Long Beach and its Mayor.

- District #33: District #33 currently comprises the cities of Azusa, Baldwin Park, Covina, Glendora, Irwindale and San Dimas. Nick Conway, Executive Director of the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments, recommended to the Subcommittee that San Dimas be moved from District #33 to District #38, as San Dimas has more of a community of interest with the cities of Claremont, La Verne and Pomona. The Subcommittee had no objection to this recommendation. Therefore, the Subcommittee recommends that District #33 be adjusted to comprise the following cities with the following population:

Azusa:	44,640
Baldwin Park:	81,146
Covina:	49,720
Glendora:	52,557
Irwindale:	1,655
<hr/>	
Adjusted Population	233,718 people

- District #38: District #38 currently comprises the cities of Claremont, Laverne and Pomona. Nick Conway, Executive Director of the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments, recommended to the Subcommittee that San Dimas be moved from District #33 to District #38, as San Dimas has more of a community of interest with the cities of Claremont, La Verne and Pomona. The Subcommittee had no objection to this recommendation. Therefore, the Subcommittee recommends that District #38 be adjusted to comprise the following cities with the following population:

Claremont:	37,141
La Verne:	33,449
Pomona:	162,140
San Dimas:	37,141
<hr/>	
Adjusted Population	269,741 people

REPORT

- District #42: District #42 currently comprises the cities of Burbank, Glendale and San Fernando and has a collective population outside of the recommended population range at 340,223 people. It is the recommendation of the Subcommittee that the City of San Fernando be moved from District #42 to form a new District with the City of Santa Clarita (i.e. new RC District #67), to establish more population balance within the affected districts. The cities of San Fernando and Santa Clarita concur with the Subcommittee's recommendation. Therefore, based upon this recommendation, District #42 would be adjusted to comprise the following cities with the following population:

Burbank:	107,921
Glendale:	207,157
<hr/>	
Adjusted Population	315,078 people

- District #43: District #43 currently comprises the cities of Lancaster, Palmdale and Santa Clarita and has a collective population outside of the recommended population range at 466,444 people. The Subcommittee recommends moving the City of Santa Clarita from District #43 to form a new District with the City of San Fernando (i.e. new RC District #67) to establish more population balance within the affected districts. The cities of San Fernando and Santa Clarita concur with the Subcommittee's recommendation. Therefore, based upon this recommendation, District #43 would be adjusted to comprise the following cities with the following population:

Lancaster:	143,818
Palmdale:	145,468
<hr/>	
Adjusted Population	289,286 people

- New District #67: As previously noted, the Subcommittee recommends that there be a new RC District formed comprising the cities of San Fernando and Santa Clarita. Both cities concur with this recommendation, and therefore, this new District #67 would comprise the following cities with the following population:

San Fernando:	25,145
Santa Clarita:	177,158
<hr/>	
Adjusted Population	202,303 people

Orange County

- District #12: District #12 currently comprises the cities of Dana Point, Laguna Beach, Laguna Niguel, San Clemente, and San Juan Capistrano. The Subcommittee recommends moving the City of Aliso Viejo from District #13 to District #12 to establish more population balance within the affected districts. The Orange County Council of Governments (OCCOG) Board concurs with this recommendation. Therefore, based upon this recommendation, District #12 would be adjusted to comprise the following cities with the following population:

REPORT

Dana Point:	36,946
Laguna Beach:	25,131
Laguna Niguel:	66,608
San Clemente:	67,373
San Juan Capistrano:	36,452
Aliso Viejo:	45,037

Adjusted Population	277,547 people
---------------------	----------------

- District #13: District #13 currently comprises the cities of Aliso Viejo, Laguna Hills, Laguna Woods, Lake Forrest, Mission Viejo and Rancho Santa Margarita and has a collective population outside of the recommended population range at 332,298 people. The Subcommittee recommends moving Aliso Viejo from District #13 to District #12 to establish more population balance within the affected districts. The OCCOG Board concurs with this recommendation. Therefore, based upon this recommendation, District #13 would be adjusted to comprise the following cities with the following population:

Laguna Hills:	33,391
Laguna Woods:	18,426
Lake Forest:	78,243
Mission Viejo:	98,483
Rancho Santa Margarita:	49,718

Adjusted Population	278,261 people
---------------------	----------------

- District #14: District #14 currently comprises the cities of Irvine and Newport Beach. To establish more population balance as well as in recognition of the anticipated future population growth for the City of Irvine [which is consistent with prior Regional Council actions, such as the adoption the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) plan], the Subcommittee recommends moving Newport Beach from District #14 to District #15. This recommendation means that District #14 would be adjusted to comprise solely of the City of Irvine, with a population of 202,079 people.

It should be noted that as of February 28, 2008, the OCCOG Board recommended that the composition of Districts #14 and #15 remain as-is. SCAG is in receipt of a letter from Sean Joyce, City Manager for the City of Irvine dated March 5, 2008, which is in opposition to the OCCOG Board decision. The letter from Irvine cited the anticipated future population growth of the City of Irvine as well as the lack of commonality between the cities of Irvine and Newport Beach as among the reasons why it supported the proposal to move Newport Beach from District #14 to District #15.

- District #15: District #15 currently comprises the cities of Costa Mesa and Fountain Valley and has a collective population outside of the recommended population range at 171,546 people. As noted above, the Subcommittee recommends moving the City of Newport Beach from District #14 to District #15 for better balance. The Subcommittee also noted that since Costa Mesa and Fountain Valley are currently not members of SCAG, moving Newport Beach from District #14 to District #15 would in turn provide

REPORT

Regional Council representation on both Districts #14 and #15. Therefore, based upon this recommendation, District #15 would be adjusted to comprise the following cities with the following population:

Costa Mesa:	113,805
Fountain Valley:	57,741
Newport Beach:	84,218
<hr/>	
Adjusted Population	255,764 people

Riverside County

- District #2: District #2 currently comprises the cities within the Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG) subregion and has a collective population outside of the recommended population range at 373,504 people. The Subcommittee recommends that two Districts within the CVAG subregion be established, which is consistent with prior requests by CVAG. After obtaining input from CVAG representatives, the Subcommittee recommends that the two districts be established to comprise the western and eastern areas of the CVAG subregion. Therefore, based upon this recommendation, District #2 would represent the western area of the CVAG subregion and be adjusted to comprise the following cities with the following population:

Cathedral City:	52,115
Desert Hot Springs:	23,544
Indian Wells:	4,942
Palm Desert:	49,752
Palm Springs:	46,858
Aliso Viejo:	16,944
<hr/>	
Adjusted Population	193,855 people

- District #63: District #63 currently comprises the cities of Canyon Lake, Corona, Lake Elsinore, Norco, and Perris. During the District Evaluations process, representatives from the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) informed the Subcommittee that the City of Wildomar was recently approved by the electorate to be a new city in California, with official incorporation to be finalized by July 1, 2008. Based upon input from WRCOG representatives, the Subcommittee recommends that Wildomar be assigned to District #63. Therefore, based upon this recommendation, District #63 would be adjusted to comprise the following cities with the following population:

Canyon Lake:	10,969
Corona:	146,164
Lake Elsinore:	47,634
Norco:	27,361
Perris:	50,663
Wildomar:	27,000
<hr/>	
Adjusted Population	309,791 people

REPORT

- New District #66: As previously noted, the Subcommittee recommends that two Districts within the CVAG subregion be established. After obtaining input from CVAG representatives, the Subcommittee recommends that the two districts be established to comprise the western and eastern areas of the CVAG subregion. Therefore, based upon this recommendation, a new RC District #66 would be established to represent the eastern area of the CVAG subregion and would comprise the following cities with the following population:

Blythe:	22,625
Coachella:	38,486
Indio:	77,146
La Quinta:	41,092
<hr/>	
Adjusted Population	179,349 people

- City of Menifee: According to WRCOG representatives, the City of Menifee is anticipated to become an official city in California within the near future. At such time, in accordance with the SCAG Bylaws, staff will consult with WRCOG, and assign Menifee to “a District with other cities with which it has contiguous borders.” Menifee has an estimated population of approximately 60,467 people.

San Bernardino County

The Subcommittee recommends no adjustments to the Districts within San Bernardino County. For those Districts in San Bernardino County which are outside of the recommended population range (i.e. Districts #10 and #11), the Subcommittee, including Councilman McCallon who served as the Chair of the Subcommittee and represented the interests of the cities within San Bernardino County, determined it best not to make any changes at this time in order to preserve the community of interests of these districts, amongst other reasons.

Ventura County

The Subcommittee recommends no adjustments to the Districts within Ventura County. While the current population of District #47 is outside of the recommended population range, the Subcommittee, including Mayor Young who served as the Vice-Chair of the Subcommittee and represented the interests of the cities within Ventura County, determined it best not to make any changes at this time in order to preserve the community of interests between the cities in District #47.

Assuming that the Regional Council approves the recommendations made by the District Evaluations Subcommittee, the changes to the Regional Council Districts will be official. While the changes proposed by the Subcommittee do not involve any changes to the SCAG Bylaws, it is the Subcommittee’s desire that the changes be forwarded to the General Assembly for information as part of the General Assembly meeting scheduled in May 2008.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Work related to the District Evaluations Subcommittee is included as part of the current Overall Work Program.

CITY NAME	SCAG_DISTR	POP_2007	RECOMMENDATIONS FROM DISTRICT EVALUATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE(DES)	NOTES
AVALON	0	3,521	City of Avalon not currently assigned to any District; based upon input from the cities of Long Beach and Avalon, DES recommends assigning Avalon to District #29, one of the two RC Districts assigned to Long Beach.	
LOS ANGELES	0	4,018,080		
	0 Total	4,021,601		
BRAWLEY	1	25,694	Outside of range; DES recommends no change to preserve subregional boundaries.	
CALEXICO	1	37,552		
CALIPATRIA	1	7,773		
EL CENTRO	1	42,071		
HOLTVILLE	1	6,299		
IMPERIAL	1	11,852		
WESTMORLAND	1	2,372		
	1 Total	133,613		
BLYTHE	2	22,625		
CATHEDRAL CITY	2	52,115	District #2 adjusted to comprise western area of CVAG (i.e. Desert Hot Springs, Palm Springs, Cathedral City, Rancho Mirage, Palm Desert and Indian Wells); new District #66 to comprise eastern area of CVAG (i.e. La Quinta, Indio, Coachella and Blythe).	
COACHELLA	2	38,486		
DESERT HOT SPRINGS	2	23,544		
INDIAN WELLS	2	4,942		
INDIO	2	77,146		
LA QUINTA	2	41,092		
PALM DESERT	2	49,752		
PALM SPRINGS	2	46,858		
RANCHO MIRAGE	2	16,944		
	2 Total	373,504	Outside of range, based upon input from CVAG representatives, DES recommends that establishment of additional district within CVAG subregion. The new district would be RC District #66 (see notes to the right).	
BANNING	3	28,272		
BEAUMONT	3	28,250		
CALIMESA	3	7,414		
MORENO VALLEY	3	180,466		

RIVERSIDE	4	291,398	
4 Total		291,398	
HEMET	5	71,705	
MURRIETA	5	97,257	
SAN JACINTO	5	34,345	
TEMECULA	5	97,935	
			Outside of range; based upon input from WRCOG, DES recommends no changes to District #3.
5 Total		301,242	
COLTON	6	51,797	
GRAND TERRACE	6	12,380	
LOMA LINDA	6	22,451	
REDLANDS	6	71,375	
YUCAIPA	6	51,784	
6 Total		209,787	
HIGHLAND	7	52,186	
SAN BERNARDINO	7	205,010	
7 Total		257,196	
FONTANA	8	181,640	
RIALTO	8	99,064	
8 Total		280,704	
MONTCLAIR	9	36,622	
RANCHO CUCAMONGA	9	172,331	
UPLAND	9	75,169	
9 Total		284,122	
CHINO	10	81,224	
CHINO HILLS	10	78,668	
ONTARIO	10	172,701	
			Outside of range; DES recommends no change to preserve community of interest.
10 Total		332,593	
BARSTOW	11	23,943	
BIG BEAR LAKE	11	6,207	
NEEDLES	11	5,759	
TWENTYNINE PALMS	11	24,830	
YUCCA VALLEY	11	21,044	
			The OCCOG Board concurs with the recommendation by the DES.
11 Total		81,783	
			Outside of range; DES recommends no change; difficult to add more cities to District.
DANA POINT	12	36,946	
LAGUNA BEACH	12	25,131	
LAGUNA NIGUEL	12	66,608	
SAN CLEMENTE	12	67,373	
SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO	12	36,452	

ALISO VIEJO LAGUNA HILLS LAGUNA WOODS LAKE FOREST MISSION VIEJO RANCHO SANTA MARGARITA	12 Total	232,510	DES recommends moving City of Aliso Viejo from District #13 to RC District #12 to create more population balance between the two districts.	The OCCOG Board concurs with the recommendation by the DES.
		13		
		45,037		
		33,391		
		18,426		
		78,243		
IRVINE NEWPORT BEACH	13 Total	323,298	Outside of range; DES recommends moving City of Aliso Viejo from District #13 to RC District #12 to create more population balance between the two districts.	The OCCOG Board concurs with the recommendation by the DES.
		14		
		202,079		
COSTA MESA FOUNTAIN VALLEY	14 Total	286,297	DES recommends moving Newport Beach from District #14 to District #15 to create more population balance as recommended that the well in recognition of growth in Irvine. This would mean composition of Districts that District #14 would be comprised solely of the City of #14 and #15 remain the same.	The OCCOG Board concurs with the recommendation by the DES.
		15		
		113,805		
SANTA ANA	15 Total	171,546	Outside of range; DES recommends moving Newport Beach from District #14 to District #15 to create more population balance as well in recognition of growth in Irvine. This change would also provide representation within District #15 (Costa Mesa and Fountain Valley are not SCAG members).	The OCCOG Board recommends that the composition of Districts #14 and #15 remain the same.
		16		
		353,428		
ORANGE TUSTIN VILLA PARK	16 Total	353,428	Outside of range; DES recommends no change as District represents entire City of Santa Ana.	The OCCOG Board concurs with the recommendation by the DES.
		17		
		138,640		
CYPRESS GARDEN GROVE LA PALMA	17 Total	215,241		
		18		
		49,284		
ANAHEIM	18 Total	238,227		
		19		
		345,556		

The OCCOG Board
concur with the
recommendation by the
DES.

Outside of range: DES recommends no change as
District represents entire City of Anaheim.

LOS ALAMITOS	19 Total	345,556
SEAL BEACH	20	12,146
STANTON	20	25,962
WESTMINSTER	20	38,981
	20	92,870

Outside of range: DES recommends no change to
preserve community of interest.

BUENA PARK	20 Total	169,959
FULLERTON	21	82,452
	21	137,367

BREA	21 Total	219,819
LA HABRA	22	39,870
PLACENTIA	22	62,483
YORBA LINDA	22	51,597
	22	67,904
	22 Total	221,854

ARTESIA	23	17,589
CERRITOS	23	54,943
HAWAIIAN GARDENS	23	15,922
NORWALK	23	110,040

Outside of range: DES recommends no change to
preserve community of interest.

BELLFLOWER	23 Total	198,494
LAKEWOOD	24	77,189
PARAMOUNT	24	83,641
SIGNAL HILL	24	58,087
	24	11,229
	24 Total	230,146

DOWNEY	25	113,587
SOUTH GATE	25	102,233
	25 Total	215,820

COMPTON	26	99,451
LYNWOOD	26	73,171

Outside of range: DES recommends no change to
preserve community of interest.

BELL	26 Total	172,622
BELL GARDENS	27	38,982
CITY OF COMMERCE	27	46,760
CUDAHY	27	13,494
HUNTINGTON PARK	27	25,870
MAYWOOD	27	64,912
VERNON	27	29,957
	27	95
	27 Total	220,070

GARDENA	28	61,947	City of Avalon not currently assigned to any District; based upon input from the cities of Long Beach and Avalon, DES recommends assigning Avalon to District #29, one of the two RC Districts assigned to Long Beach.	District #30 would be represented solely by the City of Long Beach.
HAWTHORNE	28	89,080		
INGLEWOOD	28	119,212		
28 Total		270,239		
LONG BEACH	29	492,912		
29 & 30 Total		492,912		
LA HABRA HEIGHTS	31	6,145	Based upon input from San Gabriel Valley COG, the DES recommends that San Dimas be moved from District #33 to District #38 to achieve more community of interest.	
LA MIRADA	31	50,267		
PICO RIVERA	31	67,074		
SANTA FE SPRINGS	31	17,849		
WHITTIER	31	87,190		
31 Total		228,525		
EL MONTE	32	126,282		
ROSEMEAD	32	57,427		
SOUTH EL MONTE	32	22,464		
32 Total		206,173		
AZUSA	33	48,640		
BALDWIN PARK	33	81,146		
COVINA	33	49,720		
GLEN DORA	33	52,557		
IRVINDALE	33	1,655		
SAN DIMAS	33	37,011		
33 Total		270,729		
ALHAMBRA	34	89,488		
MONTEBELLO	34	65,686		
MONTEREY PARK	34	64,508		
34 Total		219,682		
ARCADIA	35	56,556		
BRADBURY	35	938		
DUARTE	35	23,121		
MONROVIA	35	39,309		
SAN GABRIEL	35	42,691		
SAN MARINO	35	13,507		
SIERRA MADRE	35	11,039		
TEMPLE CITY	35	35,702		
35 Total		222,863		
LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE	36	21,353		

PASADENA	36	147,262	Outside of range; DES recommends no change to preserve subregional boundaries.
SOUTH PASADENA	36	25,824	
	36 Total	194,439	
CITY OF INDUSTRY	37	804	
DIAMOND BAR	37	60,207	
LA PUENTE	37	43,338	
WALNUT	37	32,297	
WEST COVINA	37	112,953	
	37 Total	249,599	
CLAREMONT	38	37,141	Based upon input from San Gabriel Valley COG, the DES recommends that San Dimas be moved from District #33 to District #38 to achieve more community of interest.
LA VERNE	38	33,449	
POMONA	38	162,140	
	38 Total	232,730	
CARSON	39	98,178	
LOMITA	39	21,127	
TORRANCE	39	148,558	
	39 Total	267,863	
EL SEGUNDO	40	17,076	
HERMOSA BEACH	40	19,474	
LAWDALE	40	33,572	
MANHATTAN BEACH	40	36,573	
PALOS VERDES ESTATES	40	14,085	
RANCHO PALOS VERDES	40	43,092	
REDONDO BEACH	40	67,495	
ROLLING HILLS	40	1,972	
ROLLING HILLS ESTATES	40	8,099	
	40 Total	241,438	
BEVERLY HILLS	41	36,084	
CULVER CITY	41	40,792	
SANTA MONICA	41	91,124	
WEST HOLLYWOOD	41	37,653	
	41 Total	205,653	
BURBANK	42	107,921	
GLENDALE	42	207,157	
SAN FERNANDO	42	25,145	
	42 Total	340,223	
LANCASTER	43	143,818	

Outside of range; DES recommends combining San Fernando with Santa Clarita to form new District (i.e. District #67).

The cities of San Fernando and Santa Clarita concur with the DES's recommendation.

PALMDALE	43	145,468	The cities of San Fernando and Santa Clarita concur with the DES's recommendation.
SANTA CLARITA	43	177,158	
Outside of range; DES recommends moving Santa Clarita to form new District with San Fernando (i.e. District #67).			
43 Total		466,444	
AGOURA HILLS	44	23,340	Outside of range; DES recommends no change to preserve subregional boundaries.
CALABASAS	44	23,652	
HIDDEN HILLS	44	2,040	
MALIBU	44	13,748	
WESTLAKE VILLAGE	44	8,893	
44 Total		71,673	
CAMARILLO	45	65,601	
OXNARD	45	192,997	
PORT HUENEME	45	22,347	
45 Total		280,945	
MOORPARK	46	36,150	
SIMI VALLEY	46	124,524	
THOUSAND OAKS	46	127,739	
46 Total		288,413	
FILLMORE	47	15,247	Outside of range; DES recommends no change to preserve community of interest.
OJAI	47	8,133	
SANTA PAULA	47	29,182	
SAN BUENAVENTURA	47	107,490	
47 Total		160,052	
The City of LA* (CD 1)	48 Total	239,900	
The City of LA* (CD 2)	49 Total	289,000	
The City of LA* (CD 3)	50 Total	279,700	
The City of LA* (CD 4)	51 Total	270,300	
The City of LA* (CD 5)	52 Total	270,000	
The City of LA* (CD 6)	53 Total	258,600	
The City of LA* (CD 7)	54 Total	284,900	
The City of LA* (CD 8)	55 Total	250,600	
The City of LA* (CD 9)	56 Total	256,300	
The City of LA* (CD 10)	57 Total	248,300	
The City of LA* (CD 11)	58 Total	272,400	
The City of LA* (CD 12)	59 Total	277,200	
The City of LA* (CD 13)	60 Total	249,000	
The City of LA* (CD 14)	61 Total	245,800	
The City of LA* (CD 15)	62 Total	264,800	
CANYON LAKE	63	10,969	
CORONA	63	146,164	

LAKE ELSINORE
 NORCO
 PERRIS

63
 63
 63

47,634
 27,361
 50,663

Based upon input from WRCOG, the City of Wildomar recently became a new city (incorporation to be finalized on July 1, 2008) and DES recommends that it be assigned to District #63.

63 Total

282,791

HUNTINGTON BEACH

64

202,250

64 Total

202,250

ADELANTO
 APPLE VALLEY
 HESPERIA
 VICTORVILLE

65
 65
 65
 65

27,139
 70,297
 85,876
 102,538

65 Total

285,850